

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE INTRODUCING
THE TERM 'NOMENCLATURALLY VALID': A USEFUL NEW
TERM IN NOMENCLATURE. Z.N.(S.)2513

By R. V. Melville (formerly Secretary) (93 Lock Road, Ham, Richmond,
U.K.)

On several occasions in recent years I have felt the need for a term to denote a name whose nomenclatural credentials are beyond reproach — that is, it is neither a junior homonym nor a junior objective synonym and it has not been rejected by the action of a first reviser (Article 24). I have coined the term 'nomenclaturally valid' to denote such names and have used it several times in the *Bulletin*. My friend Professor Dr Holthuis objects to this practice so long as the term has not been officially adopted by the Commission and written into the Code and Glossary. I must therefore explain more fully why I think the term is a useful one.

2. Examples of my use of the term may help to clear the air. I have kept no note of my use of the name so what follows is not necessarily a complete list of examples.

- (a) vol. 38, pp. 288–291, November 1981. Dr Kerzhner asked that *Capsus ater* Jakovlev, 1889 and *Lygaeus quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794 be ruled under the plenary powers to be nomenclaturally valid names. The first is a junior secondary homonym of *Capsus ater* (Linnaeus, 1758) and the second was for a time a junior secondary homonym of *Calocoris quadripunctatus* (Villers, 1789). In September 1982 (vol 39, p. 163) Dr Holthuis commented adversely on aspects of this application. In reply Dr Kerzhner said: 'I think that if, as a result of nomenclatural (not taxonomic) confusion, two or more names are used for the same species, the nomenclatural validation of one of those names (preferably the oldest and most used) serves stability better than the introduction of a further name that has never been used for the species'.
- (b) vol. 39, p. 38, March 1982. The Commission was requested to use its plenary powers to rule that *Thrips (Aptinothrips) rufa* [sic] Haliday, 1836 is a nomenclaturally valid name, although it was a junior primary homonym of *Thrips rufus* Goeze, 1778 and *Thrips rufus* Gmelin, 1790.
- (c) vol. 41, p. 186, August 1984. In reporting on the long-standing application for the conservation of *Rana maculata* Brocchi, 1877 and *Eleutherodactylus richmondi* Stejneger, 1904, I quoted a comment by Dr Sabrosky that offered four possible solutions to the problem. Under Alternative C (the original proposal) *Rana maculata* Daudin, 1801 would be suppressed. *R. maculata* Brocchi then would become nomenclaturally valid. Under Alternative D (Dr Sabrosky's proposal) *R. maculata* Daudin

would be suppressed for priority but not for homonymy, as would certain lectotype designations by the applicants. *R. macroglossa* Brocchi, 1877 becomes nomenclaturally valid rather than *R. maculata* Brocchi, which falls as junior primary homonym.

3. The definition of 'nomenclaturally valid' is narrower than the definition of 'conserved' because many proposals for conservation are concerned with subjective synonymies. A junior subjective synonym is taxonomically invalid, but it may be nomenclaturally valid at the same time.

4. The term 'validation' was long used by the Commission in connexion with names being placed on the Official List. At one time it was said that names placed on the Lists by an act of 'validation' were protected against all senior synonyms and homonyms, known and unknown, but that cannot be correct. In at least one case, both of a pair of subjective synonyms have been placed on the List; and when the 'relative precedence' procedure is applied to synonymous names, both names are placed on the List. The term 'validation' can now be seen to cover two different acts: 'nomenclatural validation' and 'conservation'. A name must be nomenclaturally valid before it can be used as a taxonomically valid name in the sense of Article 23; and the Commission can validate a name only in the nomenclatural sense.

5. I should therefore like to propose the following changes to the third edition of the Code:

Article 23m. 'A nomenclaturally valid name is not to be rejected . . .'

Article 24a, add a new Subsection (i): 'A junior objective synonym, or a junior homonym in the family group or the genus group, or a junior primary homonym in the species group that is validated by the action of a first reviser in the sense of this Article is nomenclaturally valid.'

Article 79a, add a new Subsection (i): 'A junior objective synonym, or a junior homonym in the family group or the genus group, or a junior primary homonym in the species that is validated by the use of the plenary powers is nomenclaturally valid.'

Glossary, add a new subparagraph under 'valid': 'Nomenclaturally valid. A name that is neither a junior objective synonym, nor a junior homonym in the family group or the genus group, nor a junior primary homonym in the species group, and that has not been rejected by a first reviser is a nomenclaturally valid name.'